

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KEANA MILLS,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

THE SIEGEL GROUP NEVADA INC., et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:15-cv-01318-GMN-NJK

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan. Docket No. 24. For the reasons discussed more fully below, that discovery plan is hereby **DENIED**.

The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The parties in this case seek to extend that period by 50% based entirely on the scheduling of an early neutral evaluation. Docket No. 24 at 3. Although not entirely clear, it appears that the parties do not intend to conduct discovery until after the early neutral evaluation. *See id.* While the Court certainly encourages fruitful settlement discussions, it cannot say that the scheduling of an early neutral evaluation, standing alone, provides a basis for such a broad extension of the presumptively reasonable discovery period or for a stay of discovery.

In addition, the proposed discovery plan misstates Local Rule 26-4, in that it provides that requests to extend deadlines in the scheduling order need only be filed 21 days before the discovery cut-off. *See id.* at 4. Local Rule 26-4 requires that any request to extend deadlines set forth in the scheduling order must be submitted at least 21 days before the subject deadline. For example, any

1 request to extend the deadline for initial expert disclosures must be filed at least 21 days before the
2 expiration of that deadline. Such a request filed only 21 days before the discovery cut-off would be
3 untimely.

4 In light of the above, the parties are ordered to file, no later than November 17, 2015, an
5 amended discovery plan that complies with the local rules.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: November 10, 2015

8 
9 _____
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge